Remarks

With claims 1-86 originally pending, claims 10-12, 29, 31-33, 35-41, 43, 46, 48-52, 55-61, 69, 73-75, 81 and 83-86 have been cancelled. Further, the remaining claims have been amended, and claims 87-106 have been added as shown above, and described in the remarks below.

Section 102 Rejection Based on Reilly

Claims 1, 3-12, 16-18, 20-21, 23-27, 29-33, 35-38, 40-45, 47-54, 56-58 and 60-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Reilly et al (U.S. 5,740,549). Based on the above amendments and the following comments, this rejection is now believed to be overcome.

Claim 1 has been amended to claim "providing first information in a first category; [and] providing second information with the first information, the second information indicating a choice of categories for targeted advertising not associated with the first category."

Reilly does not disclose providing an advertisement with a choice of categories not associated with a category of the information displayed with the advertisement choices. Instead, Reilly only allows a choice of an information item related to the content of information he/she is viewing. For example, if the user chooses sports news, the user gets news stories or ads related to sports. The user cannot get electronics ads or automobile ads while reading sports news. Reilly requires a custom software application with the selection of advertisement and publisher's page provided as a package. No disclosure is provided for a banner not associated with the publisher's page which is configured to be displayed with other publisher's pages as claimed. Claim 1 requires that the choice of categories be different than the content viewed. Accordingly claim 1 is believed allowable as not anticipated by Reilly

The remaining rejected claims are believed allowable based at least on their dependence on claim 1. New claims 87-92 claims subject matter similar to claim 1, and are similarly believed allowable over Reilly.

Section 103 Rejection

Claims 2, 34, 36, 39 and 59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reilly in view of Markus (U.S. 6,499,042). Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, this rejection is now believed to be overcome.

Marcus discloses generating a form/page based on a requested URL and cookies. Markus then generates the form/page using a server, as the request comes in. The present application discloses creating a URL to point to a file that already exists for a category, stored in a file system. The file is not later generated at run time by a server. The file is further located by the server using the URL without cookie information as needed by Marcus.

Claim 2 has been amended to claim a "first advertisement generated before receiving a URL." Claim 34 has been amended to claim "using at least a portion of said URL as an explicit identification of a location within a file system of stored advertisements to find said first advertisement; [and] said step of providing said first advertisement provides said first advertisement without modification." New claim 89 claims "wherein the step of displaying the first advertisement comprises displaying the first advertisement as stored in memory unaltered." New claim 90 claims "the URL is generated at least in part from a cookie, and the first advertisement is located by a remote server using the URL code without use of a cookie." By indicating the file served is generated before the URL is created and served unaltered based on a URL code without a cookie, none of claims 2, 34 and 89 are believed disclosed by Markus.

Accordingly, all claims are now believed allowable as non-obvious over Reilly in view of Markus.

Section 102 Rejection Based on Gupta

Claims 64-86 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gupta et al (U.S. 6,487,538). Based on the above amendments and the following comments, this rejection is now believed to be overcome.

Gupta discloses a proxy server that constructs a URL that is the ad request and inserts it in the web page. The present application, instead discloses a client (with browser using java script) that constructs URL that is the ad request. An outside proxy is not utilized.

Further, when no paid ads are available, the Gupta proxy constructs a URL specifically to request a default ad. However, the present application does not disclose constructing a URL specifically for a default. Only a standard URL for an ad is created, with attributes which identify a specific targeted ad although the targeted ad may not be served.

Claim 64 has been amended to indicate that the client generates the URL. New claims 91 and 99 claim generation of a URL is performed by a client using Java Script. Further new claims 92 and 104 claim generation of a URL is performed by a client browser. Accordingly claims 64, 91, 92, 99, and 104 distinguish over Gupta which does not disclose a client generating a URL, or the URL being generated from Java Script, or a browser.

Claim 77 has been amended to claim alternate content is provided by a server identified by a URL received by the server without creating an additional URL when no valid data is selected, in contrast with Gupta which constructs a URL identifying a default. Similarly, new claim 93 claims generating a URL code

to identify targeted information even when no targeted information exists, while new claim 94 indicates that the non-targeted information is not a default, in contrast with Gupta.

Accordingly, the claims of the present application are now all believed allowable over Gupta.

Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, all remaining claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/22/03

By: Thomas A. Ward
Thomas A. Ward
Reg. No. 35,732

FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800